

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

ITEMS

VOLUME 9 · NUMBER 1 · MARCH 1955
230 PARK AVENUE · NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE COUNCIL CONFERENCE

by Pendleton Herring

A MEETING of representatives of national social science councils and similar bodies took place at Unesco House in Paris on December 14–16, 1954. Representatives from organizations in the following sixteen countries were present: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Iran, Israel, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, Sweden, the United States, and Vietnam.¹ Members of the Executive Committee of the International Social Science Council and members of the Unesco Secretariat also participated. Since the proceedings are being prepared by Professor Gunnar Heckscher, as rapporteur, and will be available later from the International Social Science Council, my purpose here is to comment only on certain aspects of the meeting of possible interest to social scientists in the United States.

¹ Invitations were sent to the following: Australian National Research Council, Science House, 157 Gloucester St., Sydney; Fonds National de la Recherche Scientifique, 11 rue d'Egmont, Brussels; Canadian Social Science Research Council, 661 Island Park Drive, Ottawa 3; Fouad I National Research Council, 5 Sharia Sultan Hussein, Kasr-al-Doubara, Cairo; Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 13 Quai Anatole France, Paris 7; Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, Beucholstr. 55, Bad Godesberg, Germany; Concilio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Piazzale delle Scienze 7, Rome; Social Science Council of Japan, Ueno Park, Taito-ku, Tokyo; Norges Almenivitenskapelige Forskningsråd, Løkkeveien 7^{II}, Oslo; National Social Science Council of the Philippines, Office of the President, Republic of the Philippines, Manila; South African National Council for Social Research, c/o Dept. of Education, Arts & Science, Pretoria; Statens Samhälls- och Rättsvetenskapliga Forskningsråd Ecklesiastikdepartementet, Kanslihuset, Stockholm; Fonds National Suisse de la Recherche Scientifique, Freistr. 1, Berne; Social Science Research Council, 230 Park Ave., New York 17; India, council being formed, c/o Dr. J. D. N. Versluys, Social Science Officer, Unesco South Asia Science Cooperation Office, New Delhi; Pakistan, council being formed, c/o Mr. André Bertrand, Council member on mission to Pakistan.

Much of the time of the sessions was devoted to the presentation of introductory descriptive accounts of the organizational arrangements for the development and support of social science research activities in the various countries. The situations represented are so dissimilar that classification into types would be inappropriate. The extent of governmental control or support runs the gamut from virtually official control through an academy of science to entirely private support. Hence, once the representatives had reported upon the situations in their respective countries and exposed the wide range of differences, a discussion of common functions or methods of cooperation could hardly proceed from any single set of premises. However, the purpose of the meeting was essentially to become acquainted rather than to formulate and embark upon a program. This was the

The representatives of national organizations were: W. D. Borrie, Social Science Research Council of Australia; A. Philippovich, Federal Minister of Public Instruction, Austria; Jean Haesaert, Fonds National de la Recherche Scientifique, Belgium; A. W. Currie, Canadian Social Science Research Council; Georges Davy, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, France; M. B. Von Tieschowitz, Cultural Attaché, Germany; G. K. Khochbina, Minister of Public Instruction, Iran; S. N. Eisenstadt, Advisory Committee in the Social Sciences, Israel; Tomoo Otaka, Science Council of Japan; Sjoerd Groenman, Institute for Social Research, the Netherlands; Sverre Holm, Norges Almenivitenskapelige Forskningsråd, Norway; Felipe Franco, National Social Science Council of the Philippines; Adam Schaff and Josef Chalasinski, Academy of Sciences, Poland; Ake Bruhn-Möller and Gunnar Heckscher, Statens Samhälls- och Rättsvetenskapliga Forskningsråd, Sweden; Pendleton Herring, Social Science Research Council, United States; Nguyen-Thoai, Minister of National Education, Vietnam.

The member states of Unesco were informed of the meeting and, as indicated above, representatives of Poland attended the sessions of the conference and reported on the organization of the Academy of Sciences.

first occasion ever to bring together representatives of national social science councils. Organizational diversity was to be expected.

PROBLEMS OF ADMINISTRATION

It was interesting to find a general concern with administrative problems of research support and encouragement. Despite striking differences in national development, historical traditions, and scholarly and research resources, the group gathered at Unesco House for the most part had no difficulty in addressing their thoughts to common questions of administration. For example, the allocation of limited funds for research focuses attention on appropriate administrative devices. In Canada and in Australia, the availability of modest funds from foundations means that the social science research councils function primarily as grant-in-aid bodies. Where the preponderance of support comes from the government, the common practice is to ensure, through a grants committee or a scholarly council, representation of the academic community in the distribution of funds. Such an important function is performed, for example, by the National Council for Social and Legal Research in Sweden and, in Great Britain, through the University Grants Committee—a body to which Parliament and the Treasury delegate the responsibility of dividing among the universities the total funds voted by Parliament to supplement their other sources of income.

According to Professor E. A. G. Robinson's report for Great Britain at the conference, the Committee "covers the whole range of university education and research and is only concerned with the social sciences in their broadest relations to other branches of learning. The University Grants Committee is composed of academics (who have the full responsibility for the decisions), with an executive staff of officials. From time to time the Committee may take the view that some general branch of study requires special development. In that case it ordinarily establishes a system of 'earmarked grants' to universities, providing funds only utilizable in this field. It did in fact take that view of the social sciences just after the war, on the advice of a Committee of which Sir John Clapham, the economic historian, was Chairman. The University Grants Committee then set up a Social Sciences Sub-Committee, with about fifteen academic members, to recommend to it how the 'earmarked grant' might be distributed. The Sub-Committee considered the general development of the social sciences, the branches which specially needed expansion, the gaps which specially needed to be filled, in particular universities, and in that sense performed

one of the functions sometimes attributed to a national council. This Sub-Committee ceased to exist at the end of the quinquennium for which it distributed funds."

A comparable responsibility is discharged in France by the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, of which there are two main divisions, one for the natural sciences and one for the *sciences humaines*.

GAPS IN RESEARCH

Another common problem relates to the identification of lacunae in research. For Great Britain the situation was described by Professor Robinson as follows: "This depends mainly on the ability of individual university departments to distribute funds for research in accordance with the development and needs of the subject. A certain amount of informal discussion tends to take place, both within the various separate disciplinary associations (for economics, sociology, etc.) and between those directing the actual research institutes; thus a good deal is commonly known about the research programs of the different centers by those in other universities and institutes. There is some attempt (e.g. for economics, through the National Institute of Economic and Social Research) to see that basic primary research is not unnecessarily duplicated and is conducted in such a form that the results will be useful for a number of secondary inquiries. During the period of existence of the Social Sciences Sub-Committee of the University Grants Committee, the identification of lacunae . . . was very much one of its functions."

In the discussion of gaps, reference was made not so much to neglected topics or special aspects of a field as to the need for adding a chair of sociology or political science or some other discipline, at a given university where there was no provision for work on the particular subject.

These two illustrations call attention to distinctive problems in other countries which are of much less concern in the United States. Dependence upon the national government for major support for research must be weighed against the independence of the universities. On the other hand, the strength of the traditional faculties and their long-established fields of learning may justify effort by a responsible agency, taking a broad national view, to encourage the development of newer disciplines. Hence, there is a degree of ambivalence on the part of the academic world in thinking of research councils or grants committees. Some measure of coordination is generally looked upon as desirable, particularly in the face of limited financial resources and attendant problems of allocation. On the other hand, outside interference with university con-

cerns even by a research council of academic membership is viewed with some reservations.

TRAINING FOR RESEARCH

With regard to the training of research workers, Professor Robinson stated: "This has been regarded as primarily a responsibility of the universities. So far as a research worker requires training in methods not included in undergraduate work, most universities make some provision for the teaching. Equally, where research involves expertise in more than one discipline, it is regarded as a function of the university (not always very well carried out) to enable the student to acquire the relevant knowledge. In the field of training in statistics, the Royal Statistical Society—a body whose main field of interest has been the social sciences—has endeavoured to improve the methods of training and provide for tests of professional qualification."

COMMUNICATION AMONG RESEARCH WORKERS

The discussion disclosed clearly that the need for a council as an aid to communication among research workers is not important in countries where distances are short and travel no problem. Thus, in Israel, an Advisory Committee in the Social Sciences at the Hebrew University is quite adequate. It was pointed out, on the other hand, that in Australia the opportunities provided for meetings under the auspices of the Social Science Research Council are very helpful indeed. In Great Britain opinions concerning the utility of a council apparently vary. Some argue that the system of colleges in the great universities provides easy and natural contact among scholars in different fields, and the academic community is such that there are no important barriers that would warrant a national council for the purpose of facilitating communication.

CONTRASTING NATIONAL SITUATIONS

Disregarding distance and geography, perhaps the more important considerations relate to basic functions and purposes. We have noted the need for taking account of the viewpoints of scientists and scholars with respect to financial support and research development insofar as lacunae are concerned. We have noted also the pros and cons of research coordination as an objective. In the light of our experience in this country, it seems that the value of the Social Science Research Council lies in quite a different realm and is related to the continental scope of our educational system and to

the decentralization of control in educational matters that results from our federal system of government. Since universities and colleges in this country are either privately supported or financed by states or cities, the problems and policies of common interest to research workers throughout the country are quite different from those in countries where education is nationally organized. In any event, the Social Science Research Council in the United States has ample scope in the identification and exploration of research needs and in the appraisal and analysis of the existing state of knowledge and research within and between various social science fields. There is a wide margin here for intellectual activity and scientific curiosity that is beyond problems of university policy, as such. A national council or university grants committee as part of a national educational structure may be called upon to make decisions having a direct impact within the smaller number of universities in a country that has such a structure. There is inevitably a closer involvement in what might be called academic politics.

The variety of activities undertaken by the Social Science Research Council in this country is somewhat difficult for scholars in councils in other countries to envisage, since their experience has been confined in large measure to representing the scholarly and university viewpoints in the distribution of public monies and in getting the social sciences properly established within the universities.

INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION

As one looks ahead to the possible future development of the International Social Science Council, one may hope that it will operate at the growing edge of knowledge either in advancing fields of common interest in the social sciences or in carrying forward thought and discussion related to facilities and services helpful in their advancement. For example, the first category might embrace the promotion of research on such topics as social mobility or stratification; analyses of national income and wealth; studies of urbanization or economic growth. The second category might involve provision for conferences, seminars, or training institutes, the publication of bibliographies, or the exchange of materials.

The International Social Science Council has established an International Research Office on Social Implications of Technological Change, and also is cooperating with the United Nations in organizing a seminar to be held in Bandung, Indonesia in November 1955, that will assist in the further training of a group of demographers in southeast Asia. If financial support could be

obtained for an advanced fellowship program, to be administered by this international agency, the development of social scientists would not only be greatly aided, but the sense of common purpose of the organization itself would be greatly enhanced. Just as the Social Science Research Council in this country performs a useful role in providing for the advancement of research and intellectual interchange beyond the facilities of single universities and colleges and across disciplinary lines, so the International Social Science Council might hope to offer services and opportunities that would transcend national boundaries and nationally administered resources.

At what stage in the development of the social sciences can a research council make its contributions most effectively? This question was suggested by the conference, but not fully discussed. In the United States we may say that there was, first, the establishment of social science departments in leading universities and graduate instruction in these disciplines. This was followed by the formation of professional associations in separate social science fields, and out of the leadership within these groups came the initiative for organizing the Social Science Research Council in 1923. These three stages came roughly several decades apart. Any generalization on the basis of this experience is obviously unwarranted, except that different problems can be anticipated if the sequence is reversed.

It is my impression that the international professional associations do represent a substantial measure of common interest within disciplines. An economist, for example, can meet with fellow economists without their regarding each other as essentially American or British or Swedish. This, I think, holds for various social science disciplines in quite a number of countries, although I suspect it represents a greater problem for social scientists than for botanists, physicists, or other natural scientists. A word of caution might be expressed to those hopeful that both interdisciplinary and international collaboration can be achieved speedily on any wide scale, but experimental efforts in this direction should be tried when circumstances seem favorable.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE NEW COUNCILS

In terms of international collaboration, particular attention might be given to the application of well-tested social science knowledge. So much applied work goes on in the United States as an integral part of industrial, social welfare, or governmental activity that no research council could properly embrace more than a limited part of these diverse concerns. The situation in other countries is quite different, and opportunities for dem-

onstrating the utility of social science research and of applying this knowledge are potentially important. Indeed, in some countries acceptance of the validity of the social sciences is likely to come from government officials, industrialists, and trade unionists before acceptance is gained within university faculties. Social science institutes, now rather numerous in Europe, continue as adjuncts to the universities and are more generally supported from outside sources than by the universities directly. This relationship may continue for a generation before the activities of such institutes win acceptance and become an integral part of the university community. Hence, in some countries the newly established national social science councils may serve significantly as a means of bringing together the few scholars who believe that social, political, and economic phenomena can be studied empirically and that the findings can be usefully applied. These councils are truly pioneering ventures; where they are not essentially an administrative convenience and governmentally supported, their future is precarious. Even where they have a demonstrated but limited utility, their potential in intellectual and scientific terms is envisaged by only a small number of supporters.

A tradition that may militate against the optimum development of national councils as pioneering agencies for advancing fields of knowledge is the tendency to think of such organizations as academies in which membership is a mark of prestige. When this idea is joined with the power to allocate limited funds and thereby affect the internal policies of major universities, the hazards are aggravated. It might be well for newly established national councils to forego the temptation to regard their place as at the apex of an academic hierarchy or as the capstone of a national educational system, and think of themselves rather as functioning at a lower working level and without hierarchical status. Their primary concern then would be, as in the United States, with means of facilitating the research efforts of their fellow countrymen concerned with the advancement of social science knowledge. The national councils can well afford to leave to the long-established academies the function of honoring scholarly accomplishment. At the present stage of development, fluidity and an experimental attitude are more relevant values than stability and tradition. The councils will be called upon to justify their existence and to prove their usefulness. This may be best accomplished by directing energy to a limited program.

The representatives of the national councils met fully aware of the varied approaches to social science and the study of man, yet at no time during the three days of discussion did underlying differences of opinion or

emphasis distract attention from the common basic interests of the group. A working paper, prepared in advance of the meeting, reflected realistically both administrative and conceptual questions. It was noted, for example, that "In many countries, the administrative organization of teaching and of research is ill-adapted to the establishment of a national council." Also noted explicitly were the "very great differences of opinion" concerning "the extent to which the social sciences can claim to be really autonomous." The working paper stated that "In France, the traditional line of thought is followed which believes that the social sciences and the humanities cannot be completely separated. In other countries, however, such as the United States, the attitude held towards this point is an opposite one. . . . On the other hand, a gradual rapprochement is taking place between the social sciences and the natural sciences."

The view of the social sciences and the behavioral sciences reflected in the working paper is rather unexpected: "Since a few years, a new form of disciplinary grouping has appeared, especially in the United States. The term 'behavioral sciences' groups together disciplines or trends traditionally related to the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences. In fact, it is concerned with the aspects of all these disciplines which directly concern human conduct. What may be expected of this new breakdown? Is there any prospect of a unity of perspectives going beyond the traditional divisions? To what extent are the 'behavioral sciences' not a kind of come-back to the grouping of the 'humanities' such as they were understood in the 18th and 19th centuries?"

The participants did not dwell upon the differences or develop the ambiguities that are implicit in questions and generalizations such as those cited. When an

over-all definition was offered, the group candidly refrained from debating semantics and recognized the artificiality of simply imposing a definition upon underlying conceptual differences. The variety of viewpoints with respect to the social sciences, familiar to us in the United States, is seen in sharper diversity when scholars with distinctive national traditions are brought together. This certainly is to be expected in any such international gathering. Of greater significance was the overriding conviction that problems of human behavior and social relationships can, and must, be viewed with "critical rationality."

This drive to study human affairs in a spirit of objectivity and systematic inquiry was exemplified in very concrete terms. Organizational expression is given to this purpose either through a national social science council or a committee operating within a larger structure. The motivating forces behind this development in some countries emphasize practical needs and applied research, while in others the advancement of scientific knowledge is recognized as a social goal. Without questioning the many other ways in which man's knowledge of man must be sought and applied through institutions long traditional in various cultures, there was a readiness to explore hopefully and persistently the opportunities afforded by social science research. And, as more than one speaker emphasized, whatever organizational arrangements might be found feasible and suited to national needs, the necessity of guarding freedom of inquiry for the scholar analyzing the nature of man and society was held paramount. Organizational form for the advancement of social science research suffused with this spirit holds great promise whatever may be the detailed arrangements arising from a given national setting.

MATRILINEAL DESCENT SYSTEMS: A PRELIMINARY STATEMENT ABOUT THE SUMMER SEMINAR*

THE interuniversity summer research seminar on kinship devoted the bulk of its attention during the past summer to the analysis and interpretation of matrilineal social systems. A technical report is in preparation, but readers of *Items* may be interested in some of the prob-

lems raised by the seminar, the procedures followed, and certain of the general results.

Considerable progress has been made in recent years in our understanding of social structures and the ways in which they operate, and this knowledge has both

* The members of the interuniversity summer research seminar on kinship, held at Harvard University from June 21 to August 14, 1954, were David F. Aberle, Associate Professor of Sociology and of Anthropology, University of Michigan; Harry W. Basehart, Associate Professor of Anthropology, University of New Mexico; Elizabeth F. Colson, Associate Professor of Anthropology, Goucher College; George H. Fathauer, Assistant Professor of Sociology and Anthropology, Miami

University, Ohio; E. Kathleen Gough, Lecturer in Social Anthropology, University of Manchester, England; David M. Schneider, Assistant Professor of Social Anthropology, Harvard University (chairman); and Marshall D. Sahlins, graduate student in anthropology, Columbia University (recorder). Fred Eggan, Professor of Anthropology, University of Chicago, joined the seminar for one week.

theoretical importance and practical application. We are beginning to discover significant correlations between various aspects of the social system, and between the social system and other institutions of cultural life, in a wide range of peoples scattered throughout the world. In many areas of the world, also, the United States government and various private agencies are engaged in large-scale assistance to economic development, and to the improvement of health, literacy, and administration, the success of which frequently involves working through local groups and unfamiliar institutions.

The structure of patrilineal descent systems has been the subject of considerable anthropological research. Somewhat less attention has been paid in recent years to matrilineal systems. Yet the latter are found in important numbers in central Africa, India, Southeast Asia, Indonesia, Melanesia, and Micronesia, as well as among the Indians of North and South America. It has often been assumed that matrilineal systems are merely "mirror images," so to speak, of patrilineal systems. For a long time, also, matrilineal descent was considered to represent an earlier stage of social evolution, a view which is still too common among the public at large. Furthermore, matrilineal descent and associated practices contrast sharply with our own institutions so that differences stand out in clearer perspective.

The study of kinship systems was begun almost a century ago by Lewis H. Morgan who made the discovery that different American Indian tribes, speaking quite different languages, possessed similar patterns for the grouping of kinsmen. Impressed with the importance of these patterns among the Iroquois, he conceived of using kinship terminologies as a means of discovering the origins of the American Indian, and this led him to collect kinship terminologies throughout the world.¹ Before he had gone very far with this enterprise, however, J. J. Bachofen, a Swiss student of classical antiquity, and J. F. McLennan in England had discovered "mother right" and the principle of matrilineal descent, and had independently formulated a theory of social evolution from matriarchal to patriarchal institutions. Morgan was diverted from his search for origins to the formulation of an elaborate evolutionary sequence of social institutions, and the controversies which led to the downfall of the doctrine of social evolution resulted also in neglect of the promising beginnings in the field of kinship research.

During recent decades there has been a revival of interest in studies of social structure and kinship, particularly among British social anthropologists, and we

are beginning to understand the nature of the unilineal descent group (lineage or clan) as a corporate group controlling marriage, property, and authority; and the kinship system as a structured network of social relations which organizes and controls social behavior in many societies of the middle range of complexity. It is in this area that there is great promise of developing statements of covariation and correlation and generalizations as to the nature of total social systems.

Against this general background the seminar group concentrated on a comparative study of matrilineal descent systems. Several of the members had had field experience with matrilineal societies of varying types, as well as training in theoretical social anthropology, both here and in England, so that the group began its discussions from a common base. The seminar formulated its major problem in two parts: First, what are the distinguishing features of matrilineal descent systems? Second, in what ways do matrilineal systems differ from one another?

The seminar procedure began with a memorandum prepared by the chairman which raised questions and proposed working hypotheses. These were circulated also among a small group of senior specialists for additional comments; the surviving propositions were then tested against the analysis of seven matrilineal systems: Navaho, Ashanti, Plateau Tonga, Trobriand, Nayar, Truk, and Ulithi. Each of these was written up by one of the members of the seminar and discussed in detail by the group. To illuminate critical points, other groups were discussed in part: Hopi, Menangkabau, Haida, Tsimshian, the Muslims and Tiyyar of North Malabar, Bemba, Yao, Ndembu, and Mayombe from Africa.

While matrilineal societies face the same kinds of problems that patrilineal societies do, their solutions are frequently different. In part this is because men and women have basic roles which are not completely interchangeable, regardless of differences in the formal pattern of descent. There are no "matriarchal societies" in the sense that women hold the positions of authority. Even in the most matrilineally oriented societies which we know, such as the Nayar of southern India who have dispensed with the role of "husband" in their social system, authority is in the hands of a male, the eldest of the descent group. Matrilineal societies must keep solidarity with, and maintain control over, the women who are responsible for perpetuating the social group, as well as maintaining significant ties with the male members of the lineage group. On the other hand, patrilineal societies can and often do relinquish control over female members of the lineage or clan.

One important aspect of unilineal descent, whether matrilineal or patrilineal, is that it provides continuity

¹ Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family, published by the Smithsonian Institution in 1870, is an enduring scientific monument to Morgan's industry and abilities.

over time, and thus enables property and privileges to be held in trust for future generations. Some few societies even have *both* patrilineal and matrilineal descent groups, with different classes of property often descending in one line or the other. Residence after marriage plays an important role in forming new groupings for social action. Some societies, such as the Menangkabau of Sumatra, keep the matrilineal lineage together after marriage—a man visits his wife in her household but resides primarily in his natal household. Others allow the wife to reside in her husband's village but bring the children back to their maternal uncle to be cared for and trained. Still other societies require that the husband come to live with his wife's family or in his wife's village. These different groupings make it possible to solve the problems of authority and succession in different ways. In the case of avunculocal residence, where the sister's children return to their uncle's household, one of the sister's sons frequently inherits the house and status of his mother's brother on his death, and may marry his widow or his daughter, as well. In any case the role of the father is usually quite different from that which we think is natural.

Matrilineal systems emphasize the bonds between mother and daughter and between brother and sister, at the expense of those between husband and wife. Hence marriages are frequently unstable and there may be a high rate of divorce or separation. Unlike patrilineal societies, which can incorporate wives into the family unit, matrilineal societies have failed to solve the problem of incorporating males who marry in, except possibly where avunculocal residence is combined with marriage to the uncle's daughter ("cross-cousin marriage").

Matrilineal systems likewise tend to develop less internal differentiation—the lineage group has greater unity and perhaps a lesser tendency to divide inherited property than in patrilineally oriented societies. Matrilineal lineages and clans are less subject to fission or splitting up, and kinship ties are more strongly emphasized. The mother's brother tends to replace the father in terms of training, respect, and authority—the latter frequently develops conflicts in his affectionate relations to his own sons and his responsibilities to his sister's sons, a conflict which Malinowski has described in classic terms for the Trobrianders of Melanesia. Frequently, also, the patterns of authority and control may be centered in one male of the lineage or clan, who then passes them on to a selected matrilineal heir, a sister's son or a younger brother. This enables the other males of the lineage to develop greater flexibility in their residence and marital arrangements.

Matrilineal and matrilocal systems pose problems

with regard to affinal relationships which are not so easily solved as in patrilineal and patrilocal systems. In the Chinese family system, for example, the mother-in-law and daughter-in-law have a clear-cut ordering of rank and authority. In matrilineal-matrilocal systems there is often conflict over position and responsibility; this potential conflict may be resolved by avunculocal residence or, alternatively, through preferential marriage, since relatives by marriage are already relatives. It is around such situations that kinship systems have developed their most striking behavior patterns: avoidance and "joking" relationships. The mother-in-law is seldom a neutral figure in the kinship system of any group, our own included.

What we have said so far clearly indicates that if matrilineal descent systems differ in important ways from patrilineal systems, they also show considerable variation among themselves. The second major problem that the seminar tackled was the problem of differentiating structural types among matrilineal systems. Here there are as yet no useful models. Our first approximation centered on the distinction between what we called "strong" and "weak" systems. The Nayar, for instance, contrasted sharply with the Navaho or the Plateau Tonga of central Africa. Among the traditional Nayar a lineage segment has joint ownership of an estate, the boundaries of the matrilineal descent group are clearly marked, the estate-holding group is localized, the members of the lineage cooperate in production and distribution, inheritance of movables takes place within the group, the property-holding unit has certain clear-cut and exclusive ritual functions and has legal responsibility for the acts of its members, while a precise structure of authority and succession to authority exists within the group. The avunculate is strong and the property group has important political functions. The Navaho, on the other hand, have a descent group which does not jointly hold an estate. Within a community members of a matrilineal unit are not consistently localized with respect to members of one sex, nor does the descent group always cooperate in production and distribution. Inheritance of individual movable property takes place both within and across the boundaries of the local descent group, and the latter is not characterized by exclusive ritual cooperation. The group does, however, have some legal responsibility for its members and sometimes acts as a single legal personality. But the structure of authority is far from clear-cut, and the mother's brother is relatively weak and vested with little domestic authority.

These rather systematic differences suggest that the degree of unity and multifunctionality of the descent group and the extent to which it forms a significant

segment of the total social system are important criteria—applicable both to matrilineal and patrilineal systems. Utilizing these distinctions the seminar proceeded to investigate the relationship between unilineal unit strength and the various forms of residence, certain aspects of technology and ecology, and the interrelations of various rules for the access to livelihood with these. Finally, the patterning of relations among members of the unilineal unit and their relations outside the unit were examined.

These rather technical points are discussed in some detail in the final report of the seminar. But perhaps enough has been said to indicate the range and complexity of the problems involved in a discussion of matrilineal descent systems. The seminar believes that it has gone a long way toward elucidating the nature of matrilineal social systems and in developing a typology of unilineal structures that will be more meaningful than past attempts. Some balance has also been achieved in viewing lineage systems as kinship oriented as well as politically oriented, though it is clear that kinship systems have a somewhat different logic which requires a different preliminary classification. Some at-

tention was also paid to factors bringing about change in unilineal descent systems, but this is a seminar problem in itself.

One final comment: the seminar represented an intellectual experience which continued to generate excitement and enthusiasm from beginning to end. Its members, now scattered widely, developed a common set of problems and concepts, and a technique of working together which should have an important influence on their future research. The problems with which the seminar was concerned are not merely academic, even though they may be highly technical in spots. In contrast to our western world, most of the societies of central Asia, China, India, and Africa are unilineal in descent. These are not necessarily outmoded and a handicap. Such systems have a conservatism and a stability that we need to understand—that China's family system has endured for over two millennia should tell us something about its basic importance and the difficulties the Communists may have in attempting to destroy it as an institution. And it should warn our planners in various parts of the world to work with, rather than against, the social grain.

COMMITTEE BRIEFS

INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE OF PERSONS

(Appointed by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils)

M. H. Trytten (chairman), Francis J. Brown, Harold C. Deutsch, William L. Doyle, James S. Earley, L. H. Farinholt, Mortimer Graves, Richard H. Heindel, Sidney Painter, Ira O. Wade, Paul Weaver, Bryce Wood; staff, Francis A. Young, executive secretary; Trusten W. Russell; Elizabeth P. Lam; Gordon Macgregor; Theodore Dombras.

One of the main responsibilities of the committee since its establishment in 1948 has been to nominate candidates for government grants for research and lecturing abroad under the Fulbright Act and more recently under the Smith-Mundt Act. Insofar as time and funds have permitted, the committee has also studied some of the fundamental problems of international exchange. These studies have differed from those sponsored by the Committee on Cross-Cultural Education. As an operating agency, the Committee on International Exchange of Persons has been concerned with the application of the results of research to the practical problems encountered in the administration of exchange programs.

The committee's efforts along these lines have taken several forms, including a two-year study, now in process, of exchange programs with underdeveloped countries. It may be mentioned that the problems peculiar to these countries arise less from the fact and conditions of underdevelop-

ment than from the great differences between their cultures and educational systems and those of the United States.

A second project undertaken by the committee with the aid of a small grant from the Ford Foundation has been directed more generally to the problems of exchanging highly specialized scientific and scholarly personnel between the United States and all countries. This project has progressed in three stages: (1) a series of preliminary studies, by William Birenbaum of the University of Chicago, of the history and current status of educational exchanges at the professional level; (2) a conference, held at Princeton on December 2-4, 1954, of approximately 60 participants representing government and private agencies concerned with educational exchange; and (3) a report of the conference discussions, which is now in preparation.

The preliminary studies, which served as a basis for the conference discussions, were devoted to three major aspects of the subject: (1) the present scale and distribution of the flow of specialized personnel to and from the United States, including a survey of the principal exchange programs and their administrative agencies; (2) the stated aims and purposes of such programs, including the extent to which the intended benefits are being obtained in the United States and in the participating countries; and (3) the possibilities of incorporating in future programs the results of current research in cross-cultural education and of the experience gained over the past several years.

At the opening session of the conference, Walter Johnson of the University of Chicago gave a paper on "The Exchange Program as Seen by the Board of Foreign Scholarships." In it he stressed particularly the prime importance of bi-national foundations as planning and administrative agencies and of scholarly organizations as screening and consultative bodies. Ralph L. Beals of the University of California at Los Angeles next reviewed the implications of current research in cross-cultural education with special reference to the false or doubtful assumptions that are commonly held regarding educational exchange. William Birenbaum concluded the formal papers with an account of his experiences in obtaining the background material for the conference, and some observations on the present thinking of government, foundation, and university officials concerned with scholarly exchange.

The subsequent conference discussions were analytical and exploratory rather than definitive or conclusive. They will be reviewed at length in the published report. In general they sought to expose and clarify the problems of objectives of exchange programs, especially the difficulties that develop when individual, institutional, and governmental purposes do not agree. A great deal of attention was also given to the role of the larger academic community in the total exchange effort. The discussions were rich in clues to a more realistic conception of the nature, values, and limitations of educational exchange and in hints to the administering agencies; but many of the ideas advanced at the conference will require further study. Nevertheless, certain views developed at the conference appeared to gain fairly general acceptance and some of these may be cited to illustrate the character of the discussions.

There were repeated reminders of the difficulty of reducing the subject of educational exchange to conceptual order. It seems unlikely that any participant left the sessions without a new or strengthened realization that large-scale programs of exchange are not simple mechanisms constructed by their sponsoring agencies, and subject to a large measure of control, but are actually complex systems of cross-cultural relationships which are still far from being clearly understood. Although the number of cross-cultural relationships can be greatly expanded by organized programs of exchange, it is quite a different matter to obtain from them the social as well as the individual benefits intended. One of the difficulties is that individual interests and larger social ends become commingled without order or relationship in programs of exchange, and the immediate interests of the participating scholars and the special purposes of the sponsors can both be served only by a process of mutual adjustment and accommodation in an atmosphere of cooperation and confidence. In government programs, the cultivation of greater mutuality between official concerns and the interests of scholarship depends upon a joint effort on the part of government and educational institutions to liberalize the objectives of the exchange programs, on the one hand, and those of the participating scholars, on the other. There was general agreement at the conference

that educational institutions, acting in their corporate capacities, have yet to take a large or significant part in this effort, and that, in making their contribution to the development of educational exchange, most of them still depend almost entirely upon the initiative of individual members of their faculties.

Another difficulty that was generally recognized as besetting both the sponsoring agencies and the exchange scholars is a lack of knowledge and understanding of the cultural contexts in which educational exchanges take place. This lack puts a heavy, and in some instances an almost intolerable, strain on scholars attempting for the first time to cross the great cultural divide between the United States and the countries of Asia and the Near East. Among the remedies proposed for this difficulty were a continuation and expansion of the research already undertaken on cross-cultural education and the development of orientation services much more thorough, comprehensive, and professional than those now provided.

The conference was planned by the committee as an important, but not the final, stage in its current study of educational exchange programs and of the possibilities of improving them. For this reason, the principal value of the conference will be realized when the committee meets to consider in the light of the conference report what further steps it can take to increase the effectiveness of educational exchange at the scholarly and professional level. F.A.Y.

PACIFIC COAST COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL STATISTICS

Maurice I. Gershenson (chairman), Genevieve W. Carter, Emily H. Huntington, George M. Kuznets, Walter T. Martin, Davis McEntire, Calvin F. Schmid, Jacob Yerushalmi.

At the conference on income estimates sponsored by the committee in 1950, it was recommended that a subsequent meeting be held when the new series of personal income data, by states, became available. Pursuant to this recommendation, a conference was held in Sacramento on November 9-10, 1954 under the auspices of the California State Interdepartmental Research Coordinating Committee. Charles F. Schwartz, Assistant Chief of the National Income Division, Office of Business Economics, U. S. Department of Commerce, was the principal speaker.

The committee participated formally in the 121st annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, held in Berkeley, December 26-31, 1954. With Section K of that Association and the American Statistical Association, the committee co-sponsored two programs, dealing with regional unemployment estimates and regional indexes of business activity. In addition, a program was held on Pacific Coast population trends, under the chairmanship of Calvin F. Schmid, as a follow-up of a conference conducted by the committee in 1953. Participants included Conrad Taeuber of the Bureau of the Census, Walter T. Martin of the University of Oregon, and William A. Spurr of Stanford University.

At a meeting of the committee on December 28, plans were made for a conference on statistics in labor-management relations, to be held in the spring of 1955, and for a series of technical meetings on procedures in social statistics, similar to sessions that have been held in previous years. A subcommittee, consisting of Messrs. Schmid, McEntire, and Martin, was designated to make plans for a future conference on crime statistics.

H.E.J.

PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT

Alfred L. Baldwin (chairman), David F. Aberle, William E. Henry, Robert R. Sears, John W. M. Whiting; staff, M. Brewster Smith.

This committee was appointed in June 1954 to continue and to extend the work of the former Subcommittee on Child Development of the Committee on Social Behavior. The cross-cultural studies of child rearing that were initiated under the auspices of the subcommittee in 1954-55 are independently financed and directed, and the new committee maintains only an advisory relationship to these studies. Its November meeting therefore considered possible next steps appropriate for the Council in fostering the cross-cultural study of personality development. The previous efforts of the subcommittee seemed to need extension in two respects. The current studies, centering at Cornell, Harvard, and Yale Universities, were planned to gather cross-cultural data relevant to hypotheses concerning the causal sequence linking the child-rearing practices of parents to effects on child behavior and personality development, and these in turn to consequences in cultural beliefs and practices. The committee considered research on other causal links to be equally warranted, and expressed interest in the influence of features of social and cultural systems on cultural preferences for particular child-rearing practices. It appeared that considerable theoretical development and exploratory work would be required before the systematic and quantitative approach used in the present field studies could properly be applied to this new area.

Second, since conferences sponsored by the subcommittee in 1952 had led to collaborative cross-cultural research by psychologists and anthropologists at several universities, the committee hoped that a broader base could similarly be developed for the kind of research now envisaged as desirable. As a step toward these objectives, the committee has invited a group of anthropologists, psychologists, and sociologists to meet with it in May to discuss theoretical and methodological problems in cross-cultural research on personality development. Members of the committee and Daniel R. Miller of the University of Michigan Department of Psychology are preparing working papers for discussion at the May conference. Preliminary drafts of these papers will be reviewed by the committee in March.

POLITICAL BEHAVIOR

David B. Truman (chairman), Conrad M. Arensberg, Angus Campbell, Oliver Garceau, Alexander Heard, V. O. Key, Avery Leiserson, M. Brewster Smith.

In May 1954, the committee decided to make the comparative study of state politics its principal interest, since relatively little research has been directed toward understanding political processes at the state level. In spite of numerous respects in which the states may be less truly comparable than might initially appear, the committee believes that state politics offer distinctive advantages and opportunities for comparison. A memorandum by Oliver Garceau, developing this perspective and suggesting various problems for comparative study, was discussed by the committee in the spring of 1954 and extensively revised on the basis of its discussion. The revised document has been circulated among political scientists believed to be interested in the kind of research envisaged by the committee, with a request for comments and proposals for research within the general framework outlined. The committee met in February to review the responses received. It is hoped that support may be found for a pilot program of studies centering on functionally meaningful variables amenable to interstate comparison.

In October the committee discussed with Paul David of the Brookings Institution a proposal for an interuniversity summer research seminar to examine the data and experience of the 1952 study of presidential nominations, which was sponsored by the American Political Science Association, and suggest more explicit hypotheses for the guidance of further studies of this type. Plans for the seminar have been approved by the Committee on Problems and Policy. It will be held in Washington this summer under the joint auspices of the Brookings Institution and the Council.

PSYCHIATRY AND SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

Alexander H. Leighton (chairman), Henry W. Brosin, John A. Clausen, Joseph W. Eaton, Herbert Goldhamer, Ernest M. Gruenberg, Clyde Kluckhohn, Erich Lindemann, F. C. Redlich, Thomas A. C. Rennie, James S. Tyhurst, Edmund H. Volkart.

The committee has made substantial progress on its program, which includes a comparative and analytic review of concepts and methods relevant to understanding the nature of mental health and disease, the definition of significant areas for interdisciplinary research, and preparation of a monograph embodying the results of these activities. The committee has continuously emphasized the importance of understanding the person in a social matrix, both of which have a history and both of which undergo constant change. Thus it has been concerned with phenomena that have both individual and group aspects. These phenomena at first were defined in relation to the foci of current research projects, but the need for a broader framework led to redefinition of the phenomena as topics, such as suicide and bereavement, that would serve as "portals of entry" to analysis of the interplay of personality processes and social processes. The plan was to introduce concepts from all relevant disciplines into discussion and analysis of selected

topics, with the aim of arriving at a general theoretical statement concerning each topic. Preliminary analyses of topics would be prepared by individual members of the committee or others, for committee discussion. It was hoped that the revised analyses and conclusions would be suitable for publication as a major volume.

Preliminary papers on four topics were discussed by the committee in the spring of 1954: on frames of reference in the study of drug use among adolescents, by John A. Clausen; on bereavement, grief, and mental health, by Edmund H. Volkart; on public education and mental health, and on paranoia and the paranoid states, by James S. Tyhurst. These papers indicated promise in the committee's approach, and definite plans for an integrated monograph comprising some ten chapters were made. In addition to topics treated in the preliminary papers, the following subjects probably will be treated in separate chapters: principles for case analysis in a multidisciplinary setting, by Eric Cleveland and W. D. Longaker; socially shared psychopathology, and mental illness in later

life, by Ernest M. Gruenberg; peptic ulcers, by James S. Tyhurst; research on three social variables and the occurrence of mental disorder, by Eleanor Leacock; and normality and pathology in mental health, by F. C. Redlich. The volume will be integrated by means of an introductory section, interchapter comment, and a concluding statement, to be prepared by the chairman of the committee. Particular attention will be given to the following themes which the chapters so far prepared indicate are central to the problem of psychopathology and social environment: concepts of normality and abnormality; the relationship of social environment to the development of personality; the relationship of social environment to the emergence of symptoms; the interplay of genetically determined dispositions and the social environment in relation to mental health. Certain supplementary themes found to be important for particular aspects of mental health will also be reviewed. The present status of the monograph will be considered by the committee at a meeting late in the spring.

A.H.L.

PERSONNEL

DIRECTORS OF THE COUNCIL

The seven national social science organizations associated with the Council have designated the following persons to serve as directors of the Council for the three-year term 1955-57:

Fred Eggan, University of Chicago, by the American Anthropological Association

R. A. Gordon, University of California, Berkeley, by the American Economic Association

Louis Gottschalk, University of Chicago, by the American Historical Association

Earl Latham, Amherst College, by the American Political Science Association

Robert L. Thorndike, Columbia University, by the American Psychological Association

Conrad Taeuber, Bureau of the Census, by the American Sociological Society

Mortimer Spiegelman, Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, by the American Statistical Association.

Their credentials are scheduled for acceptance by the board of directors of the Council at its spring meeting in New York on March 26-27, 1955.

GRANTS FOR RESEARCH ON HISTORY OF AMERICAN MILITARY POLICY

The Committee on Civil-Military Relations Research—William T. R. Fox (chairman), Gordon A. Craig, John P. Miller, and Harold Stein—at a meeting on December 6, 1954 considered the applications so far received for grants-

in-aid of research under the program announced in the June 1954 issue of *Items*. The following awards were made:

William R. Braisted, Assistant Professor of History, University of Texas, for research on the development of the Far East as an American naval problem, 1909-22.

Richard C. Brown, Associate Professor of Social Studies, State University Teachers College, Buffalo, New York, for research on military policy aspects of United States participation in the Peking Relief Expedition, 1900.

Richard D. Challener, Assistant Professor of History, Princeton University, for research on relationships between American diplomatic and military policies, 1900-1917 (renewal).

Marcus Cunliffe, Department of American Studies, University of Manchester, England, for research on American military and civilian attitudes, 1815-60.

Fred Greene, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Williams College, for research on American military policy, 1920-32.

Forest G. Hill, Assistant Professor of Economics, University of California, Berkeley, for research on the relations of military and economic planning in the United States, 1815-60.

Irving B. Holley, Jr., Assistant Professor of History, Duke University, for research on General MacAuley Palmer and the relationship between the military establishment and the civilians constituting the army in wartime, 1890-1948.

William R. Kintner, Colonel, U. S. Army, and George C. Reinhardt, Colonel, U. S. Army, Retired, for re-

search on the influence of technology on American military policy, 1898-1940.

A. C. Murdaugh, Rear Admiral, U. S. Navy, Retired, Lecturer, Woodrow Wilson Department of Foreign Affairs, University of Virginia, for research on the gunboat policy of Thomas Jefferson, 1807.

Benjamin Quarles, Professor of History, Morgan State College, Maryland, for research on the Negro policy of the armed forces, 1750-1850.

George K. Tanham, Assistant Professor of History, California Institute of Technology, for research on the coordination of plans and policies of the Departments of the Army and the Navy, 1898-1919.

Gordon B. Turner, Assistant Professor of History, Princeton University, for research on the civil and military relationships that guided American military policy, 1750-90 (renewal).

APPOINTMENTS TO COUNCIL COMMITTEES

A Committee on Political Theory and Legal Philosophy Fellowships has been appointed to administer the new program of pre- and postdoctoral fellowships for advanced study and research in these fields. The members are J. Roland Pennock of Swarthmore College (chairman), Herbert A. Deane of Columbia University, David Easton of

the University of Chicago, Norman Jacobson of the University of California, Berkeley, Robert G. McCloskey of Harvard University, and Frederick Watkins of Yale University.

Everett C. Hughes of the University of Chicago (chairman), G. Heberton Evans, Jr. of Johns Hopkins University, Henry W. Riecken of the University of Minnesota, Evon Z. Vogt of Harvard University, and Payson S. Wild of Northwestern University have been appointed members of a new Council Committee on Research Training, to be concerned both with general problems of training and with development of the new program of summer research training institutes.

J. Fred Weston of the University of California at Los Angeles has been appointed a member of the Committee on Business Enterprise Research.

Alvin M. Liberman of the University of Connecticut has been appointed a member of the Committee on Linguistics and Psychology.

Chauncy D. Harris of the University of Chicago and S. Harrison Thomson of the University of Colorado have been designated members of the joint Committee on Slavic Studies, which is co-sponsored with the American Council of Learned Societies.

PUBLICATIONS

COUNCIL BULLETINS AND MONOGRAPHS

The Social Sciences in Historical Study: A Report of the Committee on Historiography, Bulletin 64. July 1954. 191 pp. Paper, \$1.75; cloth, \$2.25.

Research on Labor Mobility: An Appraisal of Research Findings in the United States, Bulletin 65, by Herbert S. Parnes. October 1954. 216 pp. \$1.75.

Labor Mobility in Six Cities, prepared by Gladys L. Palmer, with the assistance of Carol P. Brainerd, for the Committee on Labor Market Research. June 1954. 191 pp. Paper, \$2.25; cloth, \$2.75.

The Council's bulletins and monographs are distributed from the New York office of the Council.

OTHER BOOKS

America's Resources of Specialized Talent: The Report of the Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training, prepared by Dael Wolfe, Director. New York: Harper & Brothers, September 1954. 350 pp. Cloth, \$4.00.

Labor Mobility and Economic Opportunity. Related Essays by E. Wight Bakke, Philip M. Hauser, Gladys L. Palmer, Charles A. Myers, Dale Yoder, and Clark Kerr, with a Preface by Paul Webbink. Sponsored by the Committee on Labor Market Research. Cambridge: The Technology Press, and New York: John Wiley & Sons, July 1954. 125 pp. Cloth, \$3.50.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences

Directors, 1955: TAYLOR COLE, GORDON A. CRAIG, FRED EGGAN, ROBERT E. L. FARIS, R. A. GORDON, LOUIS GOTTSCHALK, ROBERT B. HALL, PENDLETON HERRING, ERNEST R. HILGARD, E. ADAMSON HOEBEL, D. GALE JOHNSON, V. O. KEY, EARL LATHAM, DONALD G. MARQUIS, JOHN P. MILLER, PHILIP E. MOSELY, FREDERICK MOSTELLER, FRANK C. NEWMAN, ROY F. NICHOLS, CARROLL L. SHARTLE, MORTIMER SPIEGELMAN, CONRAD TAEUBER, DOROTHY S. THOMAS, ROBERT L. THORNDIKE, SCHUYLER C. WALLACE, RALPH J. WATKINS, S. S. WILKS, GORDON R. WILLEY, MALCOLM M. WILLEY, DONALD YOUNG

Officers and Staff: PENDLETON HERRING, President; PAUL WEBBINK, Vice-President; ELBRIDGE SIBLEY, Executive Associate; HAROLD E. JONES, Pacific Coast Representative; BRYCE WOOD; ELEANOR C. ISBELL; JOSEPH B. CASAGRANDE; M. BREWSTER SMITH; ROBERT N. WILSON; CATHERINE V. RONNAN, Financial Secretary